DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 697 CE 056 754

TITLE	A Comparative Study of Adult Education Indianapolis/Richmond. Third-Party Evaluator Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Opportunities Industrialization Center of America State Council, Indianapolis.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	28 Sep 90
CONTRACT	V191A80006
NOTE	57p.; Handwritten participant comments will not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Adult Learning; Adult Literacy; Adult Students; Cognitive Style; *Computer Assisted Instruction; *Conventional Instruction; Disadvantaged; Instructional Effectiveness; *Literacy Education; *Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Indiana (Indianapolis); Indiana (Richmond)

ABSTRACT

A study measured the effectiveness of traditional classroom instruction versus computer-assisted instruction (CAI) in raising the competency levels of adults enrolled in adult basic education (ABE) classes one grade level for each 80 hours of instruction. Classes were conducted in Indianapolis and Richmond, Indiana, from November 1988 to April 1990. Target population for the study was economically disadvantaged adults, predominantly female, aged 17 to 67; 50 of 149 students completed the program and were compared for the study. Evaluation methodology included classroom observation, student surveys and interviews, reviews of instructional records and materials, joint site meetings, and interviews of project administrators. Testing was conducted upon entry, at 30-day intervals, and upon exit. The overall average grade level gain for all study completers was 2.2 grades at Indianapolis and 1.96 at Richmond. The overall average grade gain for CAI students was 2.6 grades compared with an average of 1.84 grades for non-CAI students. Older students made greater progress and dropped out less frequently than younger students. According to the study, the major strength of CAI was that students could monitor their own progress and affirm their mastery of skills. The traditional classroom approach often brought back earlier negative experiences for students, although instructors in both classrooms were empathetic and supportive. The study concluded that CAI works well with this population, particularly when there is an appropriate range of software. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327697

INDIANA OIC'S OF AMERICA STATE COUNCIL

FINAL REPORT

FOR

GRANT #V191A80006

SUBMITTED TO

Mr. Rich Dicola AND Mr. Jim Parker

PROGRAM MANAGERS

FOR

NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM GRANTEES

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

C/O

Mr. Richard DICola
OVAE/DNP/PIB
U.S. Department of Education
Switzer Building, Room 4512
Washington, D.C. 20202-7542

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SUBMITTED BY

MR. JOSEPH E. MATTHEWS, III
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
INDIANA OIC/A STATE COUNCIL
2445 North Meridian Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, Indiana 46208
(317) 924-8440

In fulfillment of the administrative and program requirements for the exectution of # V191A80006 during the grant period of November 01, 1988 - May 31, 1990.
SUBMITTED ON

September 28, 1990

CE 056 754

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INDIANA OIC'S OF AMERICA STATE COUNCIL

THIRD-PARTY EVALUATOR FINAL REPORT

for

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION

INDIANAPOLIS / RICHMOND

[U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM]

PERIOD COVERED: November 01, 1988 - April 30, 1990

SUBMITTED TO

Joseph E. Matthews III
Executive Director
Indiana OIC/A State Council
2445 N. Meridian Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46208

SUBMITTED BY

Glenn S. White
President
SYNTHESIS, Inc.
3419 N. Pennsylvania, E-3
Indianapolis, IN 46205
(317) 926-2819

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....Page 1

Methodology.....Page 2

  Study Questions

General Characteristics.....Page 4

  Students Completing Process
  Student Dropouts

Findings.....Page 10

  Instructional Setting
  The Students
  Completers
  Instructional Time
  Grade Level Changes per Entry/Post Tests
  Reliability of Test Results
  Dropouts

Study Conclusions.....Page 17

  Other Program Outcomes

The Study Questions.....Page 21

Summary Comments.....Page 29

Attachment I

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION
INDIANAPOLIS / RICHMOND

INTRODUCTION

The study was to measure the effectiveness of two methods - traditional classroom and computer-assisted - for teaching adults who tested below 12th grade/GED competency levels on the Adult Basic Learning Evaluation (ABLE) test. The purpose was to measure the effectiveness of the two methods in raising skill(s) levels by one grade level per 80 hours of instruction. A corollary purpose was to ascertain which method more greatly enhanced the acquisition (i.e., learning style) and retention rates for those skills over prescribed periods of time (e.g., 30 - 60 - 90+ days).

Classes began November 1988 at the Indianapolis site and December 1988 at the Richmond site and ended April 1990 at both sites.

The target population for the study would have the following characteristics: age range (16 to 60+ years); low income/economically disadvantaged; un- or underemployed; and predominately female (e.g., Work Incentive [WIN] referrals).

In addition, it was expected that the respective site populations would provide other distinct areas for comparison such as sociological background of participants and other demographic indicators.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology was multi-dimensional. Data collection procedures included the following: 1) classroom observations; 2) student surveys and interviews; 4) reviews of instructional records and materials; 5) joint site meetings; and 6) interviews of project administrators.

Testing procedures upon entry, at 30-day intervals and upon exiting were established to determine changes in performance levels using the ABLE as the testing instrument. The 4-MAT System test (4-MAT) was introduced later to assist identification of individual student learning styles.

This evaluation report is based upon data collected over a period of eighteen months. Observations and interviews were conducted: class sessions at both sites were observed (four occasions at Indianapolis and three at Richmond); all students were able to respond to a written survey and selected students at both sites were interviewed personally. Monthly and quarterly reports were compiled by the class instructors/aides and reviewed by the project administrator. Testing (entry, 30-day and exit) was conducted to the greatest extent possible. Student records were maintained by the respective instructors and/or classroom aides.

STUDY POPULATION

A total of 149 participants were enrolled and 50 met the criteria* for the comparison purposes of the study. Age range for the total population was 17 to 67 years: average age 32.3 years.

Entry literacy levels for the total population were from less than first grade (0.9) to grade 13.0. There were 51 males (34% of total) and 98 females (66% of total) in the study population and income levels ranged from less than $10,000 to more than $20,000. For better comparison purposes, the study population was categorized by literacy grade levels based upon entry test scores: Level 1 (0 - 4.9); Level 2 (5.0 - 8.9) and Level 3 (9.0 - 12.0).

STUDY QUESTIONS

To address some concerns of the readers of this evaluation report the following questions were considered:

1. Was 80 hours an appropriate measure for progress?
2. Does the program work equally well for learners of different ages, different backgrounds (e.g., entry literacy levels, income levels)?
3. Does one method appear to be better suited for a certain "type" learner - e.g., as identified by the 4-MAT test?
4. What impact does the instructor have on the learning process given the two methods used?
5. What appear to be the strengths and weaknesses of each method? Which method appears to be better for this study population?

* Completed both ABLE entry (scoring 0 - 12.0) and post tests; and attended more than 30 hours.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION
INDIANAPOLIS / RICHMOND

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Indianapolis	Richmond	Total
Total Students:	78	71	149
Female:	55 (71%)	43 (61%)	98 (66%)
Male:	23 (29%)	28 (39%)	51 (34%)
Age Level:			
16 - 24	25 (32%)	24 (34%)	49 (33%)
25 - 44	36 (46%)	38 (54%)	74 (50%)
45 -59	14 (18%)	6 (8%)	20 (13%)
60 or more	3 (4%)	3 (4%)	6 (4%)
Average Age:	33.0	31.1	
Income Level:			
10,000 or less	69 (88%)	62 (87%)	131 (88%)
10-14,999	9 (12%)	3 (4.2%)	12 (8%)
15-19,999	-0-	4 (5.6%)	4 (3%)
20,000 or more	-0-	2 (2.8%)	2 (1%)
Literacy Level:			
0 - 4.9	30 (39%)	10 (14%)	40 (27%)
5.0 - 8.9	39 (49%)	26 (37%)	65 (44%)
9.0 - 12.0	9 (12%)	35 (49%)	44 (30%)
Average Score:	7.3	8.3	
Hours in Class:			
30 or less	32 (42%)	19 (27%)	51 (34%)
31 - 60	10 (13%)	12 (17%)	22 (15%)
61 - 90	5 (6%)	8 (11%)	13 (9%)
90 - 120	4 (5%)	1 (1%)	5 (3%)
120 or more	27 (34%)	30 (43%)	57 (38%)

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION
INDIANAPOLIS / RICHMOND

STUDENTS COMPLETING PROCESS

Indianapolis

Code	Sex	Age	Last Grade	Hours	Ent.	Post	Grade Change		% Chg.	Learner Type	
K2 >	F	67	10	1,152	8.1	10.2	2.1		26%	N/T	> 2.4
E1 >	F	30	10	1,506	6.4	11.5	5.1		80%	N/T	>22.0
B1	M	22	11	114	7.4	8.2	0.8		9%	N/T	
H1	F	49	8	1,014	5.9	10.8	4.9		83%	N/T	
F1	F	38	11	132	8.3	9.4	1.1		13%	N/T	
H1 >	F	57	12	726	9.0	11.4	2.4		27%	1	>15.0
E2	F	33	10	618	6.2	7.6	1.4		23%	N/T	
E1 >	F	26	11	1,320	7.3	10.7	3.4		47%	2	>22.0
F1 >	F	40	10	1,422	9.7	12.9	3.2		33%	1/2	>21.0
E1 >	F	41	10	120	9.9	9.9	-0-		0%	1	> 0.5
E1 >	F	32	10	126	7.1	8.2	1.1		15%	N/T	> 0.5
E2 >	M	28	11	660	11.1	12.0	1.0	*	9%	N/T	> 0.5
B1	M	18	10	144	7.2	8.6	1.4		19%	N/T	
E1	F	23	11	198	11.2	12.9	1.7		15%	N/T	
H2 >	F	49	10	1,074	8.1	12.4	4.3	*	53%	4	>16.0
G1	F	59	6	240	1.3	2.6	1.3		100%	4	
G1 >	F	46	8	1,374	4.1	5.1	1.0		24%	4	> 3.0
E1	F	40	10	174	5.4	8.0	2.6		48%	N/T	
G1 >	F	31	11	1,698	3.9	4.5	0.6		15%	4	> 5.0
D1	M	39	11	132	4.5	6.9	2.4		53%	N/T	
G1 >	F	55	9	564	5.0	8.0	3.0		60%	2	> 1.0
H1 >	F	46	11	1,500	8.5	12.9	4.4		52%	1/4	>10.2
H2	F	54	9	378	6.0	10.0	4.0		67%	N/T	
J1	M	63	6	414	1.3	2.6	1.3		100%	N/T	
H1 >	F	59	10	324	5.7	6.3	0.6		11%	N/T	> 1.5
Average:		41.8	9.8	684.9	6.7	8.9	2.2		39.2%		

Ent. = Entry (Pre-Test)

> Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) Hours

* Passed GED Test.

N/T Not Tested

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION
INDIANAPOLIS / RICHMOND

STUDENTS COMPLETING PROCESS

Richmond

Code	Sex	Age	Last Grade	Hours	Ent.	Post	Grade Change		% Chg.	Learner Type
B1	F	24	9	246	7.7	8.6	0.9		12%	1
B1	F	23	9	480	7.3	11.4	4.1		56%	1
F1	F	35	7	576	9.4	11.9	2.5		27%	1
H1	F	51	8	465	6.0	8.6	2.6		43%	2
F1	F	28	10	252	10.2	11.6	1.4		14%	1
E1	F	25	11	426	8.6	11.0	2.4		28%	2
L1	M	61	8	408	12.0	11.7	-0.3		3%	N/T
E1	M	44	9	864	6.2	10.2	4.0		65%	1
K1	F	65	8	1,230	6.9	12.7	5.8		84%	4
F1	F	40	7	186	10.6	11.4	0.8	*	8%	N/T
E1	F	30	9	159	8.8	12.3	3.5		40%	N/T
E1	F	26	7	36	6.7	7.7	1.0		15%	N/T
F1	F	26	9	114	9.8	10.7	0.9		.9%	N/T
F1	F	30	9	171	9.0	11.9	2.9		32%	1
C1	F	24	8	327	9.2	12.1	2.9		32%	1
B1	F	23	8	246	6.9	7.1	0.2		3%	1
F1	F	28	9	321	9.9	12.6	2.7		27%	4
C1	M	35	9	168	6.1	9.2	3.1		50%	3
L3	F	60	9	186	11.0	9.2	-1.8		-16%	2
C4	M	18	10	204	9.7	11.2	1.5		15%	4
F1	F	28	7	543	10.2	13.0	2.8		27%	4
D1	F	37	6	321	2.3	5.4	3.1		134%	4
G1	M	45	4	120	3.5	3.4	-0.1		3%	4
D1	M	40	8	111	1.3	0.7	-0.6		46%	4
C1	M	20	11	246	10.1	13.0	3.1		31%	N/T
Average:		34.6	8.3	336.2	7.9	9.9	1.98		31.2%	

Ent. = Entry (Pre-Test)

* Passed GED Test

N/T Not Tested

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION
INDIANAPOLIS / RICHMOND

STUDENT DROPOUTS

Indianapolis

Code	Sex	Age	Last Grade	Hours	Ent.
D1	F	31	12	30	3.2
A1	F	17	10	24	3.3
E1	F	33	11	12	7.0
A1	F	17	10	84	3.3
D1	M	40	10	108	2.5
D1	F	29	9	6	
C1	F	19	11	42	11.0
E1	F	37	10	12	7.2
A1	F	17	10	6	
D1	F	36	11	6	
B2	F	18	10	54	10.4
D1	F	25	11	12	7.3
F1	F	32	8	12	11.0
B1	F	18	10	12	
D1	M	42	9	30	4.5
E1	F	38	10	14	9.5
B1	M	18	11	36	5.0
B2	F	20	11	96	7.7
D1	F	33	11	30	4.9
H1	F	45	9	6	
J1	M	65	9	6	4.5
D1	F	31	10	43	6.4
B1	M	18	11	18	8.1
E2	M	27	10	6	11.0
I1	M	48	11	684	11.7
B1	M	21	11	6	8.9
A1	M	20	10	12	9.2
D1	F	29	10	12	
E1	M	32	11	42	6.8
C1	F	18	11	60	9.5
B1	M	19	12	84	5.8
D2	F	29	12	66	4.6
A1	M	17	9	12	
F1	M	32	11	72	11.8
A1	F	23	11	12	
C1	F	23	9	12	9.8
B1	F	21	10	30	7.1
E1	M	31	10	60	7.8
E1	F	30	10	42	8.6
E1	M	36	11	198	8.1
D1	M	40	10	24	10.7
B1	M	23	12	12	9.6
D1	F	43	11	42	6.9
A1	F	22	10	6	8.8
B1	F	21	11	54	9.9
F1	F	26	11	18	11.1
B1	F	18	11	18	6.2

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION
INDIANAPOLIS / RICHMOND

STUDENT DROPOUTS

Indianapolis (Contd.)

Code	Sex	Age	Last Grade	Hours	Ent.
E1	F	29	10	6	7.2
E1	F	31	10	114	7.0
A1	M	18	10	6	
G1	F	51	10	6	
G1	F	51	11	12	
A1	F	23	8	12	5.2
Average		28.8	10.3	49.2	7.6

Richmond

Code	Sex	Age	Last Grade	Hours	Ent.
E1	F	31	7	180	6.5
I3	5	54	10	156	10.5
F1	F	28	9	180	12.5
F1	F	25	10		12.1 *
F1	F	42	9	156	11.8 *
F1	M	39	10	18	13.0 *
F1	M	32	8	75	13.0 *
B1	M	18	9	15	8.4
F1	F	37	9	66	10.3
C1	M	18	11	74	10.5
C1	M	17	11	12	11.7
C3	M	17	9	3	11.5
C1	F	20	9	3	9.8
B1	M	17	8	36	8.8
I1	M	52	8	12	12.0
E1	F	27	9	33	8.7
B1	F	26	9	39	7.9
C1	M	18	11	30	12.6
C1	F	19	12	6	11.0
B1	F	23	10	45	7.0
B1	F	23	10	24	8.3
C3	F	21	11	30	10.0
F1	F	31	10	69	10.6
F1	F	39	9	6	13.0
I1	F	47	6	69	3.1
C1	M	18	11	30	12.7
E1	F	29	7	42	5.3
D1	M	35	6	15	0.9
E1	M	30	8	24	8.4
E1	F	29	10	48	6.9
B1	F	22	9	30	5.6
C1	M	23	11	30	9.8
B1	F	21	11	150	6.6

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION
INDIANAPOLIS / RICHMOND

STUDENT DROPOUTS

Richmond (contd.)

Code	Sex	Age	Last Grade	Hours	Ent.
C1	F	18	10	6	13.0
F2	M	26	10	54	13.0
E2	M	33	8	78	6.9
E1	M	29	11	30	6.6
F1	F	32	11	126	11.8
D1	M	35	5	91	1.9
E1	M	29	11	28	5.2
G1	M	46	9	84	5.1
D1	M	40	10	48	2.0
A1	F	22	10	40	2.2
D1	F	36	6	33	1.9
D1	M	44	9	45	4.0
E2	F	31	10	81	5.3
Average:		29.3	9.2	52.3	8.5

* Passed GED Test

FINDINGS

Instructional Setting

The instructional setting and procedures at both sites met expectations and requirements for establishing "learning-conducive" surroundings. Four visits and three visits were made by the evaluator to the Indianapolis and Richmond sites, respectively: the instructors were interviewed; classes observed; and records system reviewed. Conclusions were that accurate procedures for recording student data, file coding, etc., were followed on a routine basis at Richmond. However, Indianapolis had ongoing problems with accurate recording of student data (e.g., student coding, test results, etc.) which may have had a critical effect on the results compiled and reviewed for this and prior reports. One identified cause of the problem at the Indianapolis site was the incompetence of the classroom aide who had been assigned specific responsibilities - e.g., assisting in testing; recording data; etc. Bureaucratic procedures (the site is an outreach site operated in conjunction with the Indianapolis Public Schools [IPS] system) delayed replacement of this individual until 75% of the project period had elapsed. Another problem may have been correlating data for this study with other reporting requirements mandated by the IPS system.

At each visit, the evaluator found the instructors and aides to be consistently cooperative, dedicated and competent - with the exception of the Indianapolis aide already noted.

The Richmond site had two lead instructors during the course of the project. The first instructor served from 12/88 to 06/89; the second instructor served from 08/89 to 04/90.

At both sites, treatment of students was consistently respectful, sensitive and supportive. Students had high regard for instructors that was expressed via student surveys midway through the project and selected one-on-one interviews at the project's conclusion.

The instructional setting/format at the Indianapolis site was modified (01/90) to a rotating, "learning-station" concept in an attempt to better monitor student progress in each subject area, to facilitate more self-help (e.g., computer time) and to stimulate group activity for those on similar learning levels.

Instructional facilities were different physically in that the Indianapolis site was located in the administration-community center of a public housing project and the Richmond site was housd in an older, vacated school building. The Indianapolis facility's space was restrictive at times due to the number of students and the inability to expand to another room due to other activities occurring in the building. The Richmond facility had no space restrictions.

The Students

Out of a total of 149 students enrolled during the course of the study - 78 at Indianapolis and 71 at Richmond - fifty students met the criteria for this study.

Although the overall student profile at both sites was quite similar, the following comparisons have been noted:

1. There was greater variation in income levels at Richmond while the Indianapolis site had virtually no variation.

2. While the age range for the total student population (17 -67 years) was the same at both sites, the average age at Indianapolis was two years older than at Richmond (33.0 years compared with 31.1 years).

3. Average entry literacy level for the total population was 7.8. However, the Richmond overall entry level was one grade higher (8.3) than the overall Indianapolis entry level (7.3).

Completers

Twenty-five students at each site completed the process - i.e., completed both ABLE entry (scoring 12.0 or below) and post tests; and attended more than 30 hrs. Ages ranged from 18 -67 years at Indianapolis (average: 41.8 years); and 18 - 61 years at Richmond (average: 34.6 years).

Entry literacy levels ranged from grade 1.3 at both sites to grade 11.2 at Indianapolis and grade 12.0 at Richmond. Although the mean entry literacy level for all completers was grade 7.5, the mean scores were: Indianapolis grade 6.7 and Richmond grade 7.9.

The average last grade completed was 9.8 at Indianapolis and 8.3 at Richmond. The difference between men and women at the respective sites was almost negligible: Indianapolis - men 9.8 / women 9.85; Richmond - men 8.4 / women 8.3.

At Indianapolis there were 5 men and 20 women completers; at Richmond there were 7 men and 18 women completers.

Annual income levels were as follows: Indianapolis - 20 students (16 women and 4 men) received $10,000 or less and 5 students (4 women and 1 man) were at the $11-14,999 level; Richmond - 23 students (17 women and 6 men) received $10,000 or less, one woman (employed) was at the $15-19,999 level and one man (retired) received $20,000-plus.

Instructional Time

The Indianapolis site operated 30 hours per week (6 hours per day) throughout the 18-month study. Due to start-up challenges (e.g., student confirmations; scheduling conflicts), the Richmond site operated 15 hours per week (3 hours per day) from December 1988 - June 1989 and 30 hours per week (6 hours per day) from August 1989 through April 1990.

Completers compiled the following instructional hours: 17,124 hours at Indianapolis and 8,406 hours at Richmond.

Computer assisted instruction at Indianapolis resulted in 7,634 minutes or 127.2 hours of computer assistance being utilized by 15 students or 60% of the 25 completers with the following results: computer time ranged from 21 minutes with a 1.1 grade change (or 15% increase) to 22 hours with a 5.1 grade change (or 80% increase).

(See Page 5 CAI students.)

Grade Level Changes as Indicated by Entry/Post Tests

Grade level changes among all completers ranged from a negative grade change of -1.8 to a gain of 5.8 grade levels, according to entry:post test results: the mean net gain at

Indianapolis was 2.16 and at Richmond it was 1.96. Among males the gain was 1.36 (Indianapolis) and 1.5 (Richmond); among females the gain was 2.25 (Indianapolis) and 2.14 (Richmond). The greatest grade level gain indicated by age clusters was within the Indianapolis 45 - 59 year group (2.8) followed by the Richmond and Indianapolis 25 - 44 year group (2.2 and 2.0 respectively). Lowest gains were in the Richmond 60+ year group (1.2); the Indianapolis 16 - 24 year group (1.3); and the Richmond 45 - 59 year group (1.3). (See Attachment for complete breakdown.)

Income level appeared to have little effect on grade level achievement/changes during the period of this study.

The distribution of grade level change as percentage gains by number of students is as follows:

% Gain	Indianapolis	Richmond
< - 0%	-0-	4
0 - 9%	2	3
10 - 19%	7	4
20 - 29%	4	4
30 - 39%	1	3
40 - 49%	2	2
50 - 59%	3	2
60 - 69%	2	1
70 - 79%	-0-	-0-
80 - 89%	2	1
90 - 99%	-0-	-0-
100% +	2	1

Reliability of Test Results

A review of test scores indicates that there are several reasons to question the reliability of the ABLE test as an accurate measurement of student progress - this is particularly significant when the Richmond scores indicate

four instances of negative progress (using the same test material for entry and post testing purposes); the decline is of particular concern regarding higher than average entry test scores (i.e., grade 11.0 and above and good attendance). The ABLE Level 2 was the only test administered at the Richmond site.

Consequently, actual progress is difficult to ascertain since results could be attributed to several variables including memory/retention of test material; test-taking ability; time interval between testings; and interest and/or boredom with test material. Regrettably, re-testing with different material was not an available option due to lack of alternative test materials and resources to obtain those materials.

At the Indianapolis site, the recording of test scores was not consistent during initial/interim phases of the project; however, it appears that post test results are reliable.

Dropouts

A total of 99 participants (who were recorded as "enrolled") terminated their participation before both entry and post testing could be completed. There were 53 dropouts (68%) at Indianapolis (18 male; 35 female) and 47 dropouts (66%) at Richmond (22 male; 25 female).

Among the Richmond dropouts, ten scored 12.1 or better on the ABLE test, thereby surpassing project/study criteria upon entry; and, four (2 males and 2 females) passed the GED test while "enrolled" in the program.

The average age for dropouts was 29.4 years (Indianapolis: 28.8 years; Richmond: 30 years) and the average last grade completed was 9.8 (Indianapolis: 10.3; Richmond: 9.3). The average entry level score for Richmond dropouts (8.5) was higher than the average entry level score for Indianapolis (7.6).

However, when Richmond dropouts scoring 12.1 or better at entry are deleted, the average entry level score for Richmond declines to 7.4

Reasons for "dropping -out" ranged from illness and lack of interest (e.g., merely following referral from their WIN social worker) to entering the military or obtaining employment.

For 92% of Indianapolis dropouts the income level was $10,000 or below; for 87% of Richmond dropouts the income level was $10,000 or below.

STUDY CONCLUSIONS

Of the eight students (5 at Indianapolis; 3 at Richmond) testing at Level 1 (i.e., grades 0 - 4.9) upon entry, three progressed to Level 2 during the course of the study: two with grade gains of 1.0 and 2.4 (average age: 42.5 years) at Indianapolis and one with a grade gain of 3.1 (age: 37 years) at Richmond).

Least progress in the Level 1 group was recorded for the two remaining students (average age: 42.5 years) at Richmond: -0.1 and -0.6 grade changes. For the three students (average age: 51 years) at Indianapolis not progressing to Level 2, however, there was significant progress: two doubled their entry scores (1.3 -2.6) for a 100% grade gain and one made a 0.6 grade change for a 15% gain.

Within the Level 1 group, the average grade increase for all students was 1.32 at Indianapolis and 0.8 at Richmond.

Level 1 students were generally categorized as "non readers" and Laubach instructional materials were utilized at both sites. Consequently, computer-assisted instruction (CAI) at this level was introduced/utilized at Indianapolis only with discretion and after extended observation of the students.

There were two computer-assisted students at Indianapolis: one (a Type 4 learner) made a grade gain of 1.0 (4.1 - 5.1) with 3 hours CAI and progressed to Level 2; the other (a Type 4 learner) made a grade gain of 0.6 (3.9 -4.5) with 5 hours CAI.

There were twenty-five students entering at Level 2 (i.e., grades 5.0 -8.9): 15 at Indianapolis and 10 at Richmond. Progress to Level 3 during the course of the study was recorded for seven students at Indianapolis and six students at Richmond.

The least grade gain made by Level 2 students was a 0.2 grade gain at Richmond (Type 1 Learner) and a 0.6 grade gain at Indianapolis. The greatest grade gain was a 5.8 (Type 4 Learner) at Richmond and 5.1 at Indianapolis.

The average grade gain recorded for students progressing to Level 3 was 3.82 at Richmond (average age: 37 years) and 3.66 at Indianapolis (average age: 44.8 years). The average grade gain for students not progressing to Level 3 was 1.98 at Indianapolis (average age: 37 years) and 1.18 at Richmond (average age: 31 years).

The five students progressing to Level 3 at Indianapolis who received computer-assisted instruction recorded the following scores:

1 - a 2.1 grade gain (8.1 - 10.2) 02.4 CAI hours
2 - a 5.1 grade gain (6.4 - 11.5) 22.0 CAI hours
3 - a 3.4 grade gain (7.3 - 10.7) 22.0 CAI hours T-2
4 - a 4.3 grade gain (8.1 - 12.4) 16.0 CAI hours T-4
5 - a 4.4 grade gain (8.5 - 12.9) 10.2 CAI hours T-1/4

Average Grade Gain: 3.86 Average Age: 43.6 years

There were 17 students entering the program at Level 3 (i.e., grades 9.0 - 12.0+): 5 at Indianapolis and 12 at Richmond.

Progress beyond Level 3 (e.g., scores above 12.0 or passing the GED test) was recorded for seven students: 3 at

Indianapolis (average age: 30.3 years) and 5 at Richmond (average age: 25 years): the average grade gains were 1.9 at Indianapolis and 2.46 at Richmond.

Of the three Indianapolis students progressing beyond Level 3, two received computer-assisted instruction and recorded grade gains of 3.1 (21 hours CAI) and 0.9 (0.5 hours CAI).

The GED test was passed by three Level 3 students: 2 at Indianapolis (average age: 25.5 years) and 1 (age: 40 years) at Richmond. This is the only instance when the average age at Indianapolis fell below that of Richmond. Of the two Indianapolis students one recorded a 0.9 grade change (11.1 - 12.0 with 0.5 hours CAI) and the other recorded a 1.7 grade change with no CAI. The Richmond student recorded a 0.8 grade change (10.6 -11.4).

For the remaining Level 3 students, average grade gains were 2.4 (average age: 49 years) at Indianapolis and 0.9 (average age: 37 years) at Richmond.

In summary, the overall, average grade change for all study completers was 2.2 grades at Indianapolis and 1.98 at Richmond. The overall, average grade change for CAI students was 2.6 grades compared with an average of 1.84 grades for non-CAI students (1.69 at Indianapolis and 1.98 at Richmond). The indicators are that CAI students were able to increase their literacy levels at a better rate with the greater differences occurring above entry grade level 5.0:

	CAI		Non-CAI (Indy/Rich.)	
	Avg. Chg.	Avg. Age	Avg. Chg.	Avg. Age
Level 1	1.0 gr.	46 yrs.	1.4/0.98 gr.	48.0/40.6 yrs.
Level 2	3.2 gr.	45.8 yrs.	1.8/2.76 gr.	34.1/34.6 yrs.
Level 3	2.8 gr.	41.5 yrs.	0.8/1.60 gr.	23.0/33.1 yrs.

Other Program Outcomes

In addition to helping participants improve their literacy skills, the program made a positive impact on self-images and provided them with opportunities to fulfill personal goals. Participant comments clearly indicate that the program created preferable approaches and more positive learning situations than those to which they had previous exposure. Participant comments are reflected in Attachment I.

THE STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Was 80 hours an appropriate measure for progressing one grade level?

The utilization of 80 hours as a measure for progress was adopted through an interpretation of requirements by the State of Indiana for student progress in adult education classes. However, closer examination of State of Indiana adult education regulations (after the project was in progress) revealed that the 80 hours was based solely on attendance necessary for cost reimbursement by the State to the respective adult education provider. There was no correlation between hours in class and student progress. In addition, conclusions drawn from this study would indicate that if, in fact, 80 hours were based on performance, that criteria would be in critical need of re-evaluation.

2. Does the program work equally well for learners of different ages and backgrounds (e.g., entry literacy levels, income levels)?

From a comparison of the "Findings," there appears to be little difference in grade level change/achievement that could be attributed to background (i.e., entry literacy level and income). However, the factor of age does appear to have some bearing on the study population: the average age of "dropouts" (29 years) was significantly lower than that of "completers" (38 years). Throughout the study the 25-44 age group (particularly the upper end) appear to have made the greater progress. It could be concluded that this type of

program works particularly well for this age group.

It could also be concluded that the "dropouts" chose to explore and/or felt there were more immediate or appealing options than attending adult education classes -military, jobs, etc. In addition, there were added pressures of securing adequate child care.

It could also be assumed that dropouts experienced or were more susceptible to peer pressure: "You don't want to be going to <u>them</u> classes." - i.e., to be identified with an assumedly "remedial education" program.

Certain implications (perhaps, another study) can also be drawn about the assumed "products" of a larger urban school system compared with a smaller, more rural school system; as well as student populations where one is totally urban black and the other predominately small city, rural white.

3. Does one method appear better suited for a certain "type" learner - e.g., as identified by the 4-MAT test?

Of the 50 completers, 29 received the 4-MAT test: 10 at Indianapolis and 19 at Richmond. Two Indianapolis students received split scores (e.g., on the borderline between type 1 and 4) and those instances are noted in the tabulations.

A summary of learner types as identified through the 4-MAT system is as follows:

> Type 1 learners tend to ask "Why"? Their perceptions are founded on concrete experience. Information is processed by way of reflective observation. These learners are analytical and probing; they seek a connection between their values and how learning relates to those values.

Type 2 learners as "What"? Perceptions are based upon abstract conceptualizatioin, and, as is the case with Type 1 learners, information is processed via reflective observation. These learners like precision and factual information presented in an organized and precise format. They prefer to accumulate knowledge while readily accepting the authority figure who imparts that knowledge.

Type 3 learners as "How"? Like Type 2 learners, they perceive by abstract conceptualization, but they process information by active experimentation. These learners make marvelous "tinkerers." They like to discover how something works and enjoy finding out how an abstract idea works in reality. They are doers who search for practical application of knowledge.

Type 4 learners ask "If"? Perceptions are founded upon concrete experience, and information is processed with active experimentation. These learners are able to see complex relationships between things and ideas. They are infectious in their enthusiasm about learning. Type 4 learners have a talent for creatively synthesizing the skills and knowledge others provide.

("Overview of Theories and Findings on Learning Styles" Developed by McCarthy, 1980.)

The 4-Mat System was used to indicate "learning styles" of participants who were study "completers". Results of the test relating to mean percentage of learning increases when compared with "type learners" are as follows:

	Indianapolis (10)	Richmond (19)
Type 1	28% (3.5)	26.25% (8)
Range:	13% - 52%	3% - 65%
Type 2	47% (2.5)	26%
Range:	33% - 60%	16% - 33%
Type 3	-0-	50% (1)
Range:	N/A	N/A
Type 4	49% (4)	48% (7)
Range:	24% - 100%	3% - 134%

The greatest literacy gains were among the Type 4 learners both at the low (1.3) and high (10.2) ends of entry testing. Indianapolis scores reflected a 0.6 to 4.4 range of grade gains and Richmond scores reflected a -0.6 to 5.8 range of grade gains.

4. What impact does the instructor have on the learning process given the two methods used in this study?

At both sites, the instructor was the key element to student progress. Among their contributions were providing motivation, acknowledging individuality, offering support/showing concern about absences, home problems, etc. The Indianapolis instructor had the additional task of mediating between the student and the computer - allaying anxiety, assuring/affirming exploration, etc.

Students at both sites relied on teachers for help whenever there were doubts or questions. Most students would make daily, repeated requests for help whether warranted or not. At Indianapolis, the computer program allowed students to monitor and "grade" themselves in most instances. This activity permitted students to gain confidence in their aquired skills and encouraged more active participation in the total learning process. The change in class format also encouraged better student interaction and seeking help among themselves with the teacher becoming more of an arbiter or "final" authority figure. At the Richmond site, one student with exceptional skills in math and science (gained through work experience) was quite helpful in relating math/science

concepts in ways students could grasp and understand.

The Indianapolis instructor is a certified teacher working toward a Masters degree with a reading specialty. She also had worked within the OIC adult education program before it was integrated with the IPS program. Her advanced coursework in computer-assisted instruction was invaluable in that she was able to introduce various computer programs that compared methods/software more applicable to the student population. [As a result, all computer usage is documented and there are records of program(s) (e.g., which combination of computer-assisted and classroom instruction) may be better suited for a student entering with certain characteristics tracked through this study.]

The original Richmond instructor attempted program implementation at a time when other (unforeseen) factors were affecting the overall existence of the OIC program at Richmond. The replacement instructor was a graduate of a previous program and, therefore, possessed not only teaching skills but also an empathy with the students. Enrollment showed a steady increase and classroom activities proceeded according to design (with the exception of hours per day). The program concept attained and surpassed projected goals during the final nine months.

Accurate records were maintained and student progress was appropriately monitored. The instructors were key to providing personal guidance in <u>all</u> aspects of the student's learning process. In addition, techniques were employed to

expand student independence in the learning process.

5. What appear to be the strengths and weaknesses of each method? Which method appears to be better for this study population?

In this study, the strengths of traditional classroom instruction required a close interaction/communication between the instructor and student for an effective teaching/learning environment to occur. It was crucial that the instructor controlled and monitored dissemination of information and was skilled to interpret student responses (both individually and in group settings) to provide appropriate and immediate feedback.

Social/interpersonal skills were engaged/utilized on a continuous basis to enhance the learning environment by both instructor and student(s). Overall learning was influenced by the instructor's abilities and perceptions of student's capacity to comprehend, retain and apply acquired skills in "controlled" classroom formats. Instructional materials were primarily of the instructor's choosing and were expanded and/or embellished as needed to maximize learning.

Weaknesses of the traditional classroom were in that the success of the learning situation may have been disproportionately placed upon the instructor. Among factors that would contribute greatly to the imbalance would be the student's attitude. Some examples might be as follows: "I'm only here because my counselor made me come;" "I thought I'd get paid for coming." Other factors contributing to negative

attitudes would come from parental and/or peer pressure: "Why don't you do something with your life;" or "Why are you tryin' to get educated now? It won't do you no good now."

Consequently, the student's failure to succeed in the traditional classroom setting as an adult becomes a reflection of many of the same influences and pressures that may have contributed to failure at an earlier age.

The traditional classroom approach is particularly tenuous for adult learners because their full participation in the learning process becomes an extension of an acquired maturity both mentally and emotionally. They are aware that they can pursue (and justify) other choices and options. The majority of the students who successfully completed this study were mature and realistic in their decision to participate.

The major strength of computer-assisted instruction in this study was that the student could monitor his/her own progress and affirm their mastery of skills acquired in the classroom setting. Various drills and tests illuminated the tasks and skills necessary to master various subject matter. CAI built confidence and enhanced self-esteem.

Surprisingly, there was little resistance to utilizing the computer as part of the learning process.

The major weakness was that many students did not have the basic reading skills to benefit from the CAI materials that were available.

The consensus is that the computer-assisted approach works well with this study population - particularly when there is

an appropriate range of material/software. The approach allows the student a greater sense of control over their learning and provides consistent and objective feedback.

SUMMARY COMMENTS

This study highlights some of the interests and concerns of the Indiana OIC/A State Council about some of the issues and needs of adults seeking to improve their educational performance and, thereby, their competitiveness in an ever - changing, more educationally-restrictive society. An outstanding characteristic of the students who completed the study was their acknowledgement - regardless of age - of their educational deficiencies and their determination to take advantage of an opportunity to improve their status both for personal and societal reasons. An equally outstanding trait of those not completing the study was their inability to conceptualize their futures.

The study has generated far more insight into the needs of community-based adult education programs/studies than this compilation of data can reflect. Among some of the needs and initiatives recommended for exploration are the following:

1. The provision of support services (e.g., child care and transportation) for those not eligible for routine state-supported subsidies.
2. The provision of orientation/counseling services for referrals from public agencies to assist that person's values clarification and desire to abandon a reliance upon public assistance.
3. The resources to psychometrically screen adult learners with apparent learning disabilities and the ability to access appropriate services.

4. The resources to identify and access educational materials and learning complements more appropriate to the contemporary adult learner.

In addition, the study has provided some documentation of areas for improvement in State laws and local regulations governing the conduct of adult education classes and the realistic standards that must be developed to make the education of adults both viable and cost effective.

Although the project study encountered unanticipated challenges, the purposes were met and new areas and initiatives in the area of adult education were identified. The Indiana OIC/A State Council is to be complimented for its commitment to assisting the adult learner and merits support in its continuing efforts to improve literacy among the constituency it serves.

Lastly, linkages were developed among the students - through an exchange of site visits and "pen pal" relationships - that has strengthened their respective commitments to self-improvement.

ATTACHMENT 1

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

INDIANAPOLIS

2-5[illegible]

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class? (Circle the number)

(1) 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like **best** about the program?

Infromation that is being used Now is Every day Living, and I am Very Excited about it.

3. What do you like **least** about the program?

Not Enough time for research, on class material given.

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

Start New self help programs that you Can do out Side the Class Room. Increase dictory useage.

6. How often did you **need** help from the instructor?

10 or more Times per day

7. How often did you **request** help from the instructor?

10 or more Times per day

8. What are some of the things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

almost Every Class, Paper Work, Book Work, Computor Study

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing you work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

1 (2) 3 4 5

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

No

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

If I Miss, Some child or Myself is Ill.

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

Yes, I want to Learn as must as possible for My benefit, and the benefit of My Grand Child, friends, And family.

She is Somebodys Teacher.

Site: I.O.I.C. 3201 Pattin ore

Student Classification Code: H1-1

Date: 2-28-90

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class? (Circle the number)

(1) 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like **best** about the program?

I like the teacher, she is very patience and understanding with her students, she there to help you when you need her, this is what I like best some one who have patience with ya, willing to help.

3. What do you like **least** about the program?

I like the program in its entirety

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the **instructor** is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

When I'm a subject I do not understand, she come and go over it with me, help me understand it, that me have to waste the problem stay with until I do

6. How often did you **need** help from the instructor?

several times--Times per day

7. How often did you **request** help from the instructor?

Couple--Times per day

8. What are some of the things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

I have been out of school for a while, and I need help with some subjects, especially math-english

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing you work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

(1) 2 3 4 5

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

I was working part time, which caused a problem and I was having problems due to home problems, which I hope to soon be corrected.

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

My children are experiencing some problems at the present, more time I can't attend.

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

Yes I feel it is beneficial to complete the program it will help me, to be able to acquire better employment position this is my reason for returning to school.

Site: I.O.I.C.

Student Classification Code: H2-1

Date: 2-28-90

P.S. I have attended other schools since I find at, I have been able to learn more here at O.I.C. This is due to the teacher

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class? (Circle the number)

(1) 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like **best** about the program?

It is affordable We haive good Teachers: Kindness Understanding Corparation we are more like a family.

3. What do you like **least** about the program?

I thank it is great. NO complaint.

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

spelling, writing, Reading, Math, incarage me. Keep trying you Can do Thi work.

6. How often did you **need** help from the instructor?

[illegible]-----Times per day

7. How often did you **request** help from the instructor?

[illegible]-----Times per day

8. What are some of the things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

Reading, Writing, sometimes Math, Write Essays

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing you work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

(1) 2 3 4 5

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

no

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

I Work one or two days per week.

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

Yes I do because we need this program. To finished school. It has been a great help for me.

Site: I.O.I.C.

Student Classification Code: G1-3

Date: 2-28-96

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class? (Circle the number)

(1) 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like **best** about the program?

The best thing I like about the program is that we have a good tencher

3. What do you like **least** about the program?

The least thing I like about the program is that they dont have free lunch

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

~~take~~ try to point off on one little mistake, but I know that this is to make me do better

6. How often did you **need** help from the instructor?

------Times per day

7. How often did you **request** help from the instructor?

for 7 and 8 any time I need help or request help I get it, so I can't say how many time because it can vari-

------Times per day

8. What are some of the things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

nothing because I always have question that need answers

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing you work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

1 2 3 4 5

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

NO because I need all the time that is available

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

Check day or Illness

Why? because on check day most of my bills or do on that day so I must take care of them at that time

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

Yes it will beneficial me because when I complete the programe I can better myself

Site: I.O.I.C. Indpls. Ind

Student Classification Code: B E 1-2

Date: 2-28-90

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

RICHMOND / WAYNE COUNTY

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class?

(1) 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like best about the program?

The quality of the teacher is superior to the Find Center. (where you learn NOTHING) The education I have aquired in less than 30 days, is far above any other H.E.D. avaiable in this area. It is the very best. The teachers give me a feeling of being a person.

3. What do you like least about the program?

Nothing. The quality of the program is Excellent

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

My teachers are teaching at a level that I can be understood by all students. She uses language that can be understood by all students.

6. How often did you need help from the instructor?

Several Times per day

7. How often did you request help from the instructor?

Many Times per day

8. What are some of things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

Studing with reading and spelling

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing your work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

(1) 2 3 4 5

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

None

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

To go to Dr office only

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

This program is the only way I can achive my education. Without it, I will never be able to finish school. This program and teachers are the best and the quality is the very best in this area. The only one that you can learn from.

SITE: Wayne Co

STUDENT CLASSIFICATION CODE: I-3

DATE: 4-19-90

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class?

1 (2) 3 4 5

2. What do you like best about the program?

xl have teacher that xl can comperhend
learn, and that xl am xlso learing

3. What do you like least about the program?

can't comen, because xl like this program
to the best.

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

xll you are having a problem they will help
you to learn it

6. How often did you need help from the instructor?

All time Times per day

7. How often did you request help from the instructor?

All time Times per day

8. What are some of things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

spelling, reading, math

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing your work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

(1) 2 3 4 5

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

No

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

Kids being sick

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

Yes! Because: This is my 3rd try and I've learned more in the last two months than I did when I was in the other two courses.

SITE: Wayne Co.

STUDENT CLASSIFICATION CODE: E-1

DATE: 4-19-90

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class?

(1) 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like best about the program?

I Know the teacher and she is very helpful. We get all the [illegible]

3. What do you like least about the program?

Nothing.

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

She explained [illegible]

6. How often did you need help from the instructor?

3 Times per day

7. How often did you request help from the instructor?

1 Times per day

8. What are some of things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

Study

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing your work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

1 2 3 4 5

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

No,

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

Being sick.

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

Yes, I can get my GED.

SITE: Wayne Co.

STUDENT CLASSIFICATION CODE: C-1

DATE: 4-19-90

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class?

1 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like best about the program?

I like the teachers because they have taught me a lot and they understand how I feel

3. What do you like least about the program?

nothing I like it very much

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

1 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

6. How often did you need help from the instructor?

_____Times per day

7. How often did you request help from the instructor?

_____Times per day

8. What are some of things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing your work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

1 2 3 4 5

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

SITE: Wayne Co.

STUDENT CLASSIFICATION CODE: B-1

DATE: 4-19-90

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class?

(1) 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like best about the program?

[illegible]

3. What do you like least about the program?

[illegible]

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

[illegible]

6. How often did you need help from the instructor?

[illegible] Times per day

7. How often did you request help from the instructor?

[illegible] Times per day

8. What are some of things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

[illegible]

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing your work each day? Each week? When one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

1 2 3 4 5

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

Yes

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

Child

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

Yes!

SITE: Wayne Co.

STUDENT CLASSIFICATION CODE: E-1

DATE: 4-19-90

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

1. On a scale of one to five - one being "very excited" and five being "very bored", how would you rate your participation in this class?

(1) 2 3 4 5

2. What do you like best about the program?

I like the teachers and all of my classmates we have a lot of love in this class and it shows (and I love literature and arts)

3. What do you like least about the program?

Nothing. Our program is set up so you can't like anything least. It's my second home I've taking an interest in learning and am doing good at it too

4. On a scale of one to five - one being "very important" and five being "not important", how important do you think the instructor is to your success in the program?

(1) 2 3 4 5

5. What are some of the important things the instructor did to help you?

Took the time out to help me understand that learning is real important. and also that I do have the stability to do anything I want.

6. How often did you need help from the instructor?

Constantly Times per day

7. How often did you request help from the instructor?

all the time Times per day

8. What are some of things you do during the day without needing or asking for help?

Literature and arts. Reading

9. How satisfactory was the amount of time you spent in class each week for completing your work each day? Each week? Where one is "very satisfactory" and five is "very unsatisfactory"?

(1) 2 3 4 5

STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA (DRAFT)
ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY

10. Did you have problems with the amount of time you were expected to spend in class?

No not lives.

11. What are the most frequent reasons you have to miss class?

Work. And if I miss I make up work.

12. Do you feel it is beneficial for you to continue/complete the program? Why?

Continue. My goal is to conjure my G.E.D and with out it an Vanessa all my goals will be shattered. Because they are not there just to have a job. They care that we learn an do everything in their power to make sure we do.

SITE: Wayne Co.

STUDENT CLASSIFICATION CODE: B-1

DATE: 4-19-90